## Remarks

Claims 1 – 53 were original in the application. Claims 1 – 20 were elected pursuant to a Restriction Requirement. Claims 21 – 53 have been cancelled without prejudice to be pursued in appropriate divisional applications. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, and 16 have been amended. Therefore, claims 1 – 20 as amended as submitted for substantive examination.

*The Specification/ Sequence Listing*

The specification was rejected for reciting nucleotide/amino acid sequences and filing to comply with the Notice to Comply with Requirements for Patent Applications Containing Nucleotide Sequences and/or Amino Acid Sequence Disclosures. The compliance documents accompany this amendment.

A CRF and paper version of the "Sequence Listing" are provided herewith. Applicants hereby state that the contents of the CRF and the paper version of the CRF are identical. The sequences are plainly present in the original Specification. No new matter has been added.

The present CRF floppy disk was prepared and validated by Patentin version 3.1.1.6.

The specification has also been amended to insert "SEQ ID NO:" indicators no other changes have been made, no new matter has been added.

*The Claims*

The claims were objected to for various grounds discussed below under 35 USC 112. No art was cited.

Claim 1 was regarded as inconsistent in that the claim was drawn to detection and not to quantification making in the view of the Examiner the steps of detecting the label to identify the substrate molecules and/or the altered substrate molecules from said cell or cells; and determining the presence of said chemical reaction from the presence of modified substrate useless, because one could not learn form merely detecting unaltered substrate.

The Examiner misconceives the step of detecting the label. The Examiner assumes that the detection of the label on both molecules prevents their selective identification. This is not the case. In an electrophoretic column the label is detected for both altered and unaltered substrate molecules. What is altered is not the label, but their electrophoretic mobility. The label is simply a fluorescent marker which shows the position of the molecule along the column according to its mobility. The label is detected in each case to distinguish the altered and unaltered molecules from each other, but not by virtue of the presence or absence of the label, which is in any case presence for both.

Claim 2 adds the additional step of "further comprising quantifying" so that naturally there can be no antecedent basis for the new element in claim 1.

Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12 and16 have been responsively amended.

In regard to claim 7 the Examiner assumes that labels can be present only if synthetically added and can never be naturally occurring. This assumption is not correct.

Claim 20 adds the new step of "further comprising simultaneously performing each of said steps with a plurality of different substrate molecules" and basis is provided in amended claim 1 by calling for "at least one" oncogenic protein.

Advancement of the claims to issuance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel L. Dawes
Reg. No. 27123
949 223 9600
FAX 949 223 9610

Mailing Address:
Daniel L. Dawes
5252 Kenilworth Dr.
Huntington Beach, California 92649